

1717
Patent

Attorney Docket No. 018765-171

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



In re Patent Application of

Masafumi Miyakawa et al.

Application No.: 10/507,245

Filing Date: September 10, 2004

Title: PRESSURE-SENSITIVE ADHESIVE FILM FOR THE SURFACE PROTECTION OF SEMICONDUCTOR WAFERS AND METHOD FOR PROTECTION OF SEMICONDUCTOR WAFERS WITH THE FILM

Group Art Unit: 1711

Examiner: JEFFREY C MULLIS

Confirmation No.: 9077

AMENDMENT/REPLY TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Enclosed is a reply for the above-identified patent application.

- ☐ A Petition for Extension of Time is also enclosed.
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer(s) and the ☐ \$65.00 (2814) ☐ \$130.00 (1814) fee per Disclaimer due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d) are also enclosed.
- ☐ Also enclosed is/are _____

- ☐ Small entity status is hereby claimed.
- ☐ Applicant(s) requests continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and enclose the ☐ \$395.00 (2801) ☐ \$790.00 (1801) fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e).
- ☐ Applicant(s) requests that any previously unentered after final amendments not be entered. Continued examination is requested based on the enclosed documents identified above.
- ☐ Applicant(s) previously submitted _____

_____ on _____,
for which continued examination is requested.
- ☐ Applicant(s) requests suspension of action by the Office until at least _____, which does not exceed three months from the filing of this RCE, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c). The required fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i) is enclosed.
- ☐ A Request for Entry and Consideration of Submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.129(a) (1809/2809) is also enclosed.

Buchanan Ingersoll PC
ATTORNEYS

Including attorneys from Burns Doane Swecker & Mathis

Page 1 of 2
(8/05)

- ☒ No additional claim fee is required.
- ☐ An additional claim fee is required, and is calculated as shown below.

AMENDED CLAIMS					
	No. of Claims	Highest No. of Claims Previously Paid For	Extra Claims	Rate	Additional Fee
Total Claims		MINUS =	0	x \$50.00 (1202) =	\$ 0.00
Independent Claims		MINUS =	0	x \$200.00 (1201) =	\$ 0.00
If Amendment adds multiple dependent claims, add \$360.00 (1203)					
Total Claim Amendment Fee					\$ 0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Status claimed - subtract 50% of Total Claim Amendment Fee					\$ 0.00
TOTAL ADDITIONAL CLAIM FEE DUE FOR THIS AMENDMENT					\$ 0.00

- ☐ A check in the amount of _____ is enclosed for the fee due.
- ☐ Charge _____ to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.
- ☐ Charge _____ to credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.


The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800. This paper is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: Oct. 11, 2005

By 
Robert G. Mukai
Registration No. 28,531

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

Masafumi MIYAKAWA et al.

Application No.: 10/507,245

Filed: September 10, 2004

For: PRESSURE-SENSITIVE ADHESIVE FILM FOR
THE SURFACE PROTECTION OF
SEMICONDUCTOR WAFERS AND METHOD
FOR PROTECTION OF SEMICONDUCTOR
WAFERS WITH THE FILM



)
)
) Group Art Unit: 1711

)
) Examiner: J. Mullis

)
) Confirmation No.: 9077
)
)

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION AND ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENTS

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in the Official Action, applicants hereby elect the subject matter of Group I which currently includes claims 1-5. This election is made with traverse since the present application is a national stage application wherein unity of invention standards are applicable, not the standards applicable to restriction requirements. In this respect, claim 1 is the only independent claim currently pending and all the remaining claims dependent directly or indirectly from claim 1. Therefore, if claim 1 is found allowable, the remaining claims should likewise be found allowable. This is particularly true with respect to the present application which is subject to the rejoinder provisions of MPEP §821.04.

As a further point which indicates that the requirement is in error, claim 4 relates to a protecting method, similar to claims 6-8, and has been included in Group I. Therefore, if claim 4 is included in Group I, claims 6-8 should also be included. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the restriction requirement.

With regard to the election of species requirement, applicants hereby elect acrylic rubber. This election is made without traverse since all the claims are generic as the Examiner has noted.

Response to Restriction and Election of Species Requirements

Application No. 10/507,245


Attorney's Docket No. 018765-171

Page 2

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any aspect of the present application, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

By: 
Robert G. Mukai
Registration No. 28,531

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: October 11, 2005